arXiv:1402.4580v1 [math.DG] 19 Feb 2014

Semi-parallel real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians *

Tee-How Loo
Institute of Mathematical Sciences, University of Malaya
50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
looth@um.edu.my

Abstract

We prove that there does not exist any semi-parallel real hypersurface in complex two-plane Grassmannians. With this result, the nonexistence of recurrent real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians can also be proved.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 53C40 53B25; Secondary 53C15.

Key words and phrases. Complex two-plane Grassmannians, semi-parallel real hypersurfaces, recurrent real hypersurfaces, Hopf hypersurfaces

1 Introduction

The notion of semi-parallel submanifolds, as a generalization of parallel submanifolds (submanifolds with parallel second fundamental form), was first studied by Deprez in [6]. A submanifold M in a Riemannian manifold is said to be *semi-parallel* if the second fundamental form h satisfies $\bar{R} \cdot h = 0$, where $\bar{R}$ is the curvature tensor corresponding to the van der Waerden-Bortolotti connection.

It was proved in [5] that a semi-parallel hypersurface in a Euclidean space is either flat; parallel; or is an open part of a round cone or of a product of a round cone and a linear subspace. When the ambient space is a sphere or real hyperbolic space, Dillen showed that a semi-parallel hypersurface is either an open part of a flat surface, parallel or an open part of a rotation hypersurfaces of certain helices [7]. A thorough survey on the study of semi-parallel submanifolds in a real space form can be found in [12].

When the ambient space is a non-flat complex space form, parallel submanifolds were classified by Naitoh [16]. As a result, the shape operator of a real hypersurface cannot be parallel. The existence problem of semi-parallel real hypersurfaces was first studied by Maeda [15] for complex projective spaces of complex dimension greater than two, followed by Niegerball and Ryan [17] for non-flat complex space forms of complex dimension two; and had completely been solved by Ortega [18].

*This work was supported in part by the UMRG research grant (Grant No. RG163/11AFR)

Theorem 1 ([18]). *There does not exist any semi-parallel real hypersurface in a non-flat complex space form.*

For codimension greater than one, Kon [10] proved that there does not exist any semi-parallel proper CR-submanifold in a complex projective space with semi-flat normal connection and with CR-dimension greater than one. As a byproduct of their main results in [4], Chacón and Lobos have classified all semi-parallel Lagrangian surfaces in a complex space form.

The study of Riemannian submanifolds has been extended to ambient spaces which are symmetric spaces other than real space forms and complex space forms. In particular, the study of real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ has been an active field recently.

$G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ is the unique compact irreducible Riemannian symmetric space with both a Kaehler structure J and a quaternionic Kaehler structure $\mathfrak{J}$. These two geometric structures induce on its real hypersurfaces M a (local) almost contact 3-structure (ϕ_a, ξ_a, η_a), $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and almost contact structure (ϕ, ξ, η). In [2], Berndt and Suh classified all real hypersurfaces M in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ on which both $\mathrm{Span}\{\xi\}$ and $\mathfrak{D}^\perp$ are invariant under the shape operator A of M, where $\mathfrak{D}^\perp$ is the distribution on M defined by $\mathfrak{D}^\perp_x = \mathrm{Span}\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$, $x \in M$. Such real hypersurfaces can be expressed as tubes around totally geodesic submanifolds $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+1})$ or $\mathbb{H}P_{m/2}$ in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ (cf. Theorem 5).

Since then, a number of interesting results along this line have been obtained. For instance, the characterizations of real hypersurfaces under certain nice relationships between the shape operator A and the almost contact structure ϕ (see [3], [21]); and some recent papers (see [13], [14], [20]). In [19], Suh proved the following result.

Theorem 2 ([19]). *There does not exist any parallel real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$.*

Motivated by Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, it is natural to ask if there are any semi-parallel real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. In this paper, we shall answer this question in negative, that is,

Theorem 3. *There does not exist any semi-parallel real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$.*

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a vector bundle over a manifold M. A nonzero $\mathcal{E}$-valued tensor field F of type (r, s) on M is said to be *recurrent* if there exists a 1-form ω in M such that $\bar{\nabla}F = F \otimes \omega$, where $\bar{\nabla}$ is the var der Waerden-Bortolotti connection. In particular, if $\omega = 0$ then F is parallel. Some geometric interpretations of a manifold M with recurrent curvature tensor in terms of holonomy group were given in [9], [23].

A submanifold of a Riemannian manifold is said to be *recurrent* if its second fundamental form is recurrent. The problem of determining the existence of (or classifying) recurrent real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ has been considered and solved partially. In [22], the nonexistence of recurrent real hypersurfaces was proved under an additional assumption of $\mathfrak{D}$-invariance of the shape operator. Kim, Lee and Yang proved in [8] that there does not exist any Hopf hypersurface with recurrent shape operator. Recall that a real hypersurface is said to be *Hopf* if the Reeb vector field ξ is principal.

The second objective of this paper is to study the existence of recurrent real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. We first show that a recurrent symmetric tensor field F of type $(1,1)$ on a Riemannian manifold is necessarily semi-parallel (cf. Theorem 20). With this result and Theorem 3, we prove the nonexistence of recurrent real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$ (cf. Corollary 21). This improves the results of Suh [22] and Kim, Lee and Yang [8] mentioned above.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some basic properties for $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ and its real hypersurfaces M. In Section 3, we first introduce a local symmetric tensor field θ_a of type $(1,1)$ on M, and then derive some of its properties. The proof of Theorem 3 will be given in the next section. In the last section, we prove the nonexistence of recurrent real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$.

2 Real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$

In this section we state some structural equations as well as some known results in the theory of real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians. We begin with some basic properties of complex two-plane Grassmannians (cf. [1]), which are needed in our paper.

By $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, we denote the set of all complex two-dimensional linear subspaces in $\mathbb{C}_{m+2}$. Note that $G_2(\mathbb{C}_3)$ is isometric to the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P_2(8)$ and $G_2(\mathbb{C}_4)$ is isometric to the real Grassmannian $G_2^+(\mathbb{R}^6)$ of oriented two-dimensional linear subspaces in $\mathbb{R}^8$. In this paper, we only consider $m \geq 3$.

Denote by $\langle , \rangle$ the Riemannian metric, J the Kaehler structure and $\mathfrak{J}$ the quaternionic Kaehler structure on $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. For each $x \in G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, we denote by $\{J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ a canonical local basis of $\mathfrak{J}$ on a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of x in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, that is, each J_a is a local almost Hermitian structure such that

$$J_a J_{a+1} = J_{a+2} = -J_{a+1} J_a, \quad a \in \{1,2,3\}. \tag{1}$$

Here, the index is taken modulo three. Denote by $\hat{\nabla}$ the Levi-Civita connection of $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. There exist local 1-forms q_1, q_2 and q_3 such that

$$\hat{\nabla}_X J_a = q_{a+2}(X) J_{a+1} - q_{a+1}(X) J_{a+2}$$

for any $X \in T_x G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, that is, $\mathfrak{J}$ is parallel with respect to $\hat{\nabla}$. The Kaehler structure J and quarternionic Kaehler structure $\mathfrak{J}$ are related by

$$JJ_a = J_a J; \quad \text{Trace}\,(JJ_a) = 0, \quad a \in \{1,2,3\}. \tag{2}$$

The Riemannian curvature tensor $\hat{R}$ of $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ is locally given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{R}(X,Y)Z =& \langle Y,Z\rangle X - \langle X,Z\rangle Y + \langle JY,Z\rangle JX - \langle JX,Z\rangle JY - 2\langle JX,Y\rangle JZ \\ &+ \sum_{a=1}^{3} \{\langle J_a Y,Z\rangle J_a X - \langle J_a X,Z\rangle J_a Y - 2\langle J_a X,Y\rangle J_a Z \\ &+ \langle JJ_a Y,Z\rangle JJ_a X - \langle JJ_a X,Z\rangle JJ_a Y\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for all X, Y and $Z \in T_xG_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$.

For a nonzero vector $X \in T_xG_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, we denote by $\mathbb{C}X = \mathrm{Span}\{X, JX\}$, $\mathfrak{J}X = \{J'X | J' \in \mathfrak{J}_x\}$, $\mathbb{H}X = \mathrm{Span}\{X\} \oplus \mathfrak{J}X$, and $\mathbb{HC}X$ the subspace spanned by $\mathbb{H}X$ and $\mathbb{H}JX$. If $JX \in \mathfrak{J}X$, we denote by $\mathbb{C}^{\perp}X$ the orthogonal complement of $\mathbb{C}X$ in $\mathbb{H}X$.

Let M be a connected oriented real hypersurface isometrically immersed in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$, N a unit normal vector field on M. The Riemannian metric on M is denoted by the same $\langle , \rangle$. A canonical local basis $\{J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ of $\mathfrak{J}$ on $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ induces a local almost contact metric 3-structure $(\phi_a, \xi_a, \eta_a, \langle , \rangle)$ on M by

$$J_aX = \phi_aX + \eta_a(X)N, \quad J_aN = -\xi, \quad \eta_a(X) = \langle \xi_a, X \rangle$$

for any $X \in TM$. It follows from (1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\phi_a\phi_{a+1} - \xi_a \otimes \eta_{a+1} = \phi_{a+2} = -\phi_{a+1}\phi_a + \xi_{a+1} \otimes \eta_a \\
&\phi_a\xi_{a+1} = \xi_{a+2} = -\phi_{a+1}\xi_a.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote by $(\phi, \xi, \eta, \langle , \rangle)$ the almost contact metric structure on M induced by J, that is,

$$JX = \phi X + \eta(X)N, \quad JN = -\xi, \quad \eta(X) = \langle \xi, X \rangle.$$

The vector field ξ is known as the *Reeb vector field*. A real hypersurface M is said to be *Hopf* if ξ is principal.

It follows from (2) that the two structures $(\phi, \xi, \eta, \langle , \rangle)$ and $(\phi_a, \xi_a, \eta_a, \langle , \rangle)$ are related as follows

$$\phi_a\phi - \xi_a \otimes \eta = \phi\phi_a - \xi \otimes \eta_a; \quad \phi\xi_a = \phi_a\xi.$$

Denote by ∇ the Levi-Civita connection and A the shape operator on M. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\nabla_X\phi)Y = \eta(Y)AX - \langle AX, Y \rangle\xi, \quad \nabla_X\xi = \phi AX \\
&(\nabla_X\phi_a)Y = \eta_a(Y)AX - \langle AX, Y \rangle\xi_a + q_{a+2}(X)\phi_{a+1}Y - q_{a+1}(X)\phi_{a+2}Y \\
&\nabla_X\xi_a = \phi_aAX + q_{a+2}(X)\xi_{a+1} - q_{a+1}(X)\xi_{a+2}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $X, Y \in TM$. From these formulas, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
X\eta(\xi_a) &= \langle \nabla_X\xi, \xi_a \rangle + \langle \xi, \nabla_X\xi_a \rangle \\
&= -2\langle A\phi\xi_a, X \rangle + \eta(\xi_{a+1})q_{a+2}(X) - \eta(\xi_{a+2})q_{a+1}(X).
\end{aligned}$$

We define a distribution $\mathfrak{D}^{\perp}$ on M by $\mathfrak{D}^{\perp}_x := \mathrm{Span}\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$, $x \in M$, and denote by $\mathfrak{D}$ its orthogonal complement in TM. If $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}$ at each point in M then $\eta(\xi_a) = 0$, for $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and so by the above equation, we obtain

Lemma 4. *Let M be a real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. If ξ is tangent to $\mathfrak{D}$ then $A\phi\xi_a = 0$, for $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.*

Finally we state some well-known results.

Theorem 5 ([2]). *Let M be a connected real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$. Then both* $\mathrm{Span}\{\xi\}$ *and $\mathfrak{D}^\perp$ are invariant under the shape operator of M if and only if*

(A) M is an open part of a tube around a totally geodesic $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+1})$ in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, or

(B) m is even, say $m = 2n$, and M is an open part of a tube around a totally geodesic $\mathbb{H}P_n$ in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$.

Theorem 6 ([2]). *Let M be a real hypersurface of type A in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. Then $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}^\perp$ at each point of M. Suppose $J_1 \in \mathfrak{J}$ such that $J_1 N = JN$. Then M has three (if $r = \pi/2\sqrt{8}$) or four (otherwise) distinct constant principal curvatures*

$$\alpha = \sqrt{8}\cot(\sqrt{8}r),\ \beta = \sqrt{2}\cot(\sqrt{2}r),\ \lambda = -\sqrt{2}\tan(\sqrt{2}r),\ \mu = 0$$

with some $r \in]0, \pi/\sqrt{8}[$. The corresponding multiplicities are

$$m(\alpha) = 1,\ m(\beta) = 2,\ m(\lambda) = 2m - 2 = m(\mu)$$

and the corresponding eigenspaces are

$$\begin{aligned} T_\alpha =& \mathrm{Span}\{\xi\},\ T_\beta = \mathbb{C}^\perp\xi, \\ T_\lambda =& \{X : X \perp \mathbb{H}\xi,\ JX = J_1X\}, \\ T_\mu =& \{X : X \perp \mathbb{H}\xi,\ JX = -J_1X\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7 ([2]). *Let M be a real hypersurface of type B in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. Then $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}$ at each point of M, m is even, say $m = 2n$, and M has five distinct constant principal curvatures*

$$\alpha = -2\tan(2r),\ \beta = 2\cot(2r),\ \gamma = 0,\ \lambda = \cot(r),\ \mu = -\tan(r)$$

with some $r \in]0, \pi/4[$. The corresponding multiplicities are

$$m(\alpha) = 1,\ m(\beta) = 3 = m(\gamma),\ m(\lambda) = 4n - 4 = m(\mu)$$

and the corresponding eigenspaces are

$$T_\alpha = \mathrm{Span}\{\xi\},\ T_\beta = \mathfrak{J}J\xi,\ T_\gamma = \mathfrak{J}\xi,\ T_\lambda,\ T_\mu,$$

where $T_\lambda \oplus T_\mu = (\mathbb{H}\mathbb{C}\xi)^\perp$, $\mathfrak{J}T_\lambda = T_\lambda$, $\mathfrak{J}T_\mu = T_\mu$, $JT_\lambda = T_\mu$.

Theorem 8 ([11]). *Let M be a connected orientable Hopf real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$. Then the Reeb vector ξ belongs to the distribution $\mathfrak{D}$ if and only if M is locally congruent to an open part of a real hypersurface of type B.*

3 The symmetric tensor fields θ_a

In this section, we introduce a local symmetric endomorphism θ_a in TM for real hypersurfaces M in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. With the notion θ_a, some fundamental identities such as the Gauss equation, to certain extent, could be expressed in a comparatively compact

form. Besides, it possesses some nice characteristics, which are crucial in the proof of our main result.

Let M be a real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$. Corresponding to each canonical local basis $\{J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ of $\mathfrak{J}$, we define a local endomorphism θ_a on TM by

$$\theta_a X := \tan(J_a J X) = \phi_a \phi X - \eta(X)\xi_a = \phi\phi_a X - \eta_a(X)\xi. \tag{4}$$

Let R be the curvature tensor of M. It follows from (3) that the equation of Gauss is given by

$$\begin{aligned} R(X,Y)Z &= \langle Y,Z\rangle X - \langle X,Z\rangle Y + \langle \phi Y, Z\rangle \phi X - \langle \phi X, Z\rangle \phi Y - 2\langle \phi X, Y\rangle \phi Z \\ &+ \sum_{a=1}^{3} \{\langle \phi_a Y, Z\rangle \phi_a X - \langle \phi_a X, Z\rangle \phi_a Y - 2\langle \phi_a X, Y\rangle \phi_a Z \\ &+ \langle \theta_a Y, Z\rangle \theta_a X - \langle \theta_a X, Z\rangle \theta_a Y\} + \langle AY, Z\rangle AX - \langle AX, Z\rangle AY. \end{aligned}$$

for any $X, Y, Z \in TM$. Next, we derive some properties of θ_a.

Lemma 9. *(a) θ_a is symmetric,*

(b) $\mathrm{Trace}\,(\theta_a) = \eta(\xi_a)$,

(c) $\theta_a^2 X = X - \langle X, \phi\xi_a\rangle \phi\xi_a$, *for all* $X \in TM$,

(d) $\theta_a \xi = -\xi_a; \quad \theta_a \xi_a = -\xi; \quad \theta_a \phi\xi_a = \eta(\xi_a)\phi\xi_a$,

(e) $\theta_a \xi_{a+1} = \phi\xi_{a+2} = -\theta_{a+1}\xi_a$,

(f) $\theta_a \phi\xi_{a+1} = -\xi_{a+2} + \eta(\xi_{a+1})\phi\xi_a$,

(g) $\theta_{a+1}\phi\xi_a = \xi_{a+2} + \eta(\xi_a)\phi\xi_{a+1}$.

Proof. For any $X, Y \in TM$,

$$\langle \theta_a X, Y\rangle - \langle X, \theta_a Y\rangle = \langle \phi\phi_a X, Y\rangle - \eta(Y)\eta_a(X) - \langle X, \phi_a \phi Y\rangle + \eta_a(X)\eta(Y) = 0.$$

This gives Statement (a).

Let $\{e_1, \cdots, e_{4m-1}\}$ be an orthonormal basis on T_xM, $x \in M$. Then it follows from $\mathrm{Trace}(JJ_a) = 0$ that

$$0 = \sum_j \langle JJ_a e_j, e_j\rangle + \langle JJ_a N, N\rangle = \sum_j \langle \theta_a e_j, e_j\rangle - \eta(\xi_a) = \mathrm{Trace}(\theta_a) - \eta(\xi_a).$$

This gives Statement (b).

Statements (c)–(g) can be obtained by direct calculations as below:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_a^2 X =& (\phi\phi_a - \xi\otimes\eta_a)(\phi_a\phi - \xi_a\otimes\eta)X = \phi\phi_a^2\phi X + \eta(X)\xi \\ =& -\phi^2 X + \eta(X)\xi + \eta_a(\phi X)\phi\xi_a = X - \langle \phi\xi_a, X\rangle \xi_a; \\ \theta_a\xi =& (\phi_a\phi - \xi_a\otimes\eta)\xi = -\xi_a; \\ \theta_a\xi_a =& (\phi\phi_a - \xi\otimes\eta_a)\xi_a = -\xi; \\ \theta_a\phi\xi_a =& (\phi_a\phi - \xi_a\otimes\eta)\phi\xi_a = \phi_a(-\xi_a + \eta(\xi_a)\xi) = \eta(\xi_a)\phi\xi_a; \\ \theta_a\xi_{a+1} =& (\phi\phi_a - \xi\otimes\eta_a)\xi_{a+1} = \phi\phi_a\xi_{a+1} = \phi\xi_{a+2}; \\ \theta_{a+1}\xi_a =& (\phi\phi_{a+1} - \xi\otimes\eta_{a+1})\xi_a = \phi\phi_{a+1}\xi_a = -\xi_{a+2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

For each $x \in M$, we define a subspace $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ of T_xM by

$$\mathcal{H}^\perp := \mathrm{Span}\{\xi, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \phi\xi_1, \phi\xi_2, \phi\xi_3\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the orthogonal complement of $\mathbb{HC}\xi$ in $T_xG_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. Then $T_xM = \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}^\perp$. From the above identities, we see that $\mathcal{H}$ is invariant under ϕ, ϕ_a and θ_a. It follows from Lemma 9(c) that $\theta_{a|\mathcal{H}}$ has two possible eigenvalues: 1 and -1.

Let $\mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon)$ be the eigenspace of $\theta_{a|\mathcal{H}}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Since $\theta_a\phi X = -\phi_a X = \phi\theta_a X$, for $X \in \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon)$ is ϕ-invariant and so it is of even dimension. Moreover, since $\theta_a\theta_b X = -\phi_a\phi_b X = \phi_b\phi_a X = -\theta_b\theta_a X$, for $a \neq b$, $X \in \mathcal{H}$, and each $\theta_{a|\mathcal{H}}$ is an automorphism in $\mathcal{H}$, we see that $\theta_b\mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{H}_a(-\varepsilon)$. Hence, each $\theta_{a|\mathcal{H}}$ has exactly two eigenvalues ± 1 and $\dim H_a(1) = \dim H_a(-1)$ is even.

Further, for $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon)$, $b \neq a$, since $\theta_b X \in \mathcal{H}_a(-\varepsilon)$ and $\phi Y \in \mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon)$, we have $\langle \phi_b X, Y\rangle = \langle \theta_b X, \phi Y\rangle = 0$, that is, $\phi_b\mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{H}_a(-\varepsilon)$. We summarize these observations as below.

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon)$ be the eigenspace corresponds to eigenvalue ε of $\theta_{a|\mathcal{H}}$. Then*

(a) $\theta_{a|\mathcal{H}}$ has two eigenvalues $\varepsilon = \pm 1$,

(b) $\phi\mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon)$,

(c) $\theta_b\mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{H}_a(-\varepsilon)$, for $a \neq b$,

(d) $\dim \mathcal{H}_a(1) = \dim \mathcal{H}_a(-1)$ is even,

(e) $\phi_b\mathcal{H}_a(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{H}_a(-\varepsilon)$, for $a \neq b$.

By the properties of θ_a, we have

Lemma 11. *(a) $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}^\perp$ if and only if $\dim \mathcal{H}^\perp = 3$.*

(b) If $\xi \in \mathcal{D}$ then $\xi, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \phi\xi_1, \phi\xi_2, \phi\xi_3$ are orthonormal.

(c) $\xi \notin \mathfrak{D}^\perp$ if and only if $\dim \mathcal{H}^\perp = 7$.

Proof. By Lemma 10(d), $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ is of odd dimension. Since ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 are orthonormal, we obtain $\dim \mathcal{H}^\perp \in \{3, 5, 7\}$ and Statement (a).

If $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}$ then

$$0 = \langle \theta_a\phi\xi_a, \phi\xi_{a+1}\rangle = \langle \phi\xi_a, \theta_a\phi\xi_{a+1}\rangle = \langle \phi\xi_a, -\xi_{a+2}\rangle.$$

Similarly, we also have $\langle \phi\xi_a\xi_{a+1}\rangle = 0$ and we obtained Statement (b).

In view of Statement (b), we only have to verify the case: $\xi \notin \mathfrak{D}$ and $\xi \notin \mathfrak{D}^\perp$. We select an appropriate canonical local basis $\{J_1, J_2, J_3\}$ $\mathfrak{J}_{|M}$ such that $0 < \eta(\xi_1) < 1$, $\eta(\xi_2) = \eta(\xi_3) = 0$. It follows that $\langle \xi_2, \phi\xi_3\rangle = \eta(\xi_1) \neq 0$ and so we have the following orthogonal eigenvectors of θ_1:

$$\phi\xi_1, \xi \pm \xi_1,\ \xi_2 \pm \phi\xi_3,\ \xi_3 \pm \phi\xi_2.$$

This gives Statement (c). □

4 Semi-parallel real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$

Recall that a tensor field F of type $(1,s)$ of a Riemannian manifold M is said to be *semi-parallel* if $R\cdot F=0$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}(R(X,Y)F)(X_1,\cdots,X_s) =& R(X,Y)F(X_1,\cdots,X_s)\\ &-\sum_{i=1}^{s}F(X_1,\cdots,R(X,Y)X_i,\cdots,X_s)=0.\end{aligned}$$

A real hypersurface M in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ is said to be *semi-parallel* if $R\cdot A=0$.

Throughout this section, we suppose M is a semi-parallel real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m\geq 3$, and we use the following notations:

$$\alpha=\langle A\xi,\xi\rangle,\quad \alpha_a=\langle A\xi_a,\xi_a\rangle,\quad u_a=\eta_a(\xi).$$

Let $Y,Z\in T_xM$, $x\in M$. It follows from $\langle(R(\xi,Y)A)Z,\xi\rangle=0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}&\alpha\langle AY,AZ\rangle+\{1-||A\xi||^2\}\langle Y,AZ\rangle-\alpha\langle Y,Z\rangle-\langle A^2\xi,Z\rangle\langle A\xi,Y\rangle+\langle A^2\xi,Y\rangle\langle A\xi,Z\rangle\\ &-\langle A\xi,Z\rangle\langle\xi,Y\rangle+\langle A\xi,Y\rangle\langle\xi,Z\rangle+\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{3\langle A\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle-\langle\phi_aY,Z\rangle\langle A\xi,\phi\xi_a\rangle\\ &-\langle\phi_aA\xi,Y\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle-2\langle\phi_aA\xi,Z\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle-u_a\langle A\theta_aY,Z\rangle-\langle A\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle\xi_a,Y\rangle\\ &+\langle\theta_aY,Z\rangle\langle A\xi_a,\xi\rangle-\langle\theta_aA\xi,Y\rangle\langle\xi_a,Z\rangle\}=0;\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

By switching Y and Z in this equation, and then subtracting the obtained equation from (5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&-2\langle A^2\xi,Z\rangle\langle A\xi,Y\rangle+2\langle A^2\xi,Y\rangle\langle A\xi,Z\rangle-2\langle A\xi,Z\rangle\langle\xi,Y\rangle+2\langle A\xi,Y\rangle\langle\xi,Z\rangle\\ &+\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{3\langle A\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle-3\langle A\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle-2\langle\phi_aY,Z\rangle\langle A\xi,\phi\xi_a\rangle\\ &-\langle\phi_aA\xi,Z\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle+\langle\phi_aA\xi,Y\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle-\langle A\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle\xi_a,Y\rangle+\langle A\xi_a,Y\rangle\langle\xi_a,Z\rangle\\ &+\langle\theta_aA\xi,Z\rangle\langle\xi_a,Y\rangle-\langle\theta_aA\xi,Y\rangle\langle\xi_a,Z\rangle-u_a\langle A\theta_aY-\theta_aAY,Z\rangle\}=0.\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

Let $\{e_1,\cdots,e_{4m-1}\}$ be an orthonormal basis on T_xM, $x\in M$. Then it follows from

$$\sum_j\{\langle(R(e_j,Y)A)Z,e_j\rangle-\langle(R(e_j,Z)A)Y,e_j\rangle\}=0$$

that

$$\begin{aligned}&-3\langle A\xi,Z\rangle\langle\xi,Y\rangle+3\langle A\xi,Y\rangle\langle\xi,Z\rangle+\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{-3\langle A\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle\xi_a,Y\rangle+3\langle A\xi_a,Y\rangle\langle\xi_a,Z\rangle\\ &+\langle A\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle-\langle A\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle+u_a\langle A\theta_aY-\theta_aAY,Z\rangle\}=0.\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Also, from $\langle (R(Z,Y)A)\xi,\xi\rangle = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\langle A^2\xi,Z\rangle\langle A\xi,Y\rangle + \langle A^2\xi,Y\rangle\langle A\xi,Z\rangle - \langle A\xi,Z\rangle\langle \xi,Y\rangle + \langle A\xi,Y\rangle\langle \xi,Z\rangle \\
&+\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{-\langle \phi_a A\xi,Z\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a,Y\rangle + \langle \phi_a A\xi,Y\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a,Z\rangle - 2\langle \phi_a Y,Z\rangle\langle A\xi,\phi\xi_a\rangle \\
&+\langle \theta_a A\xi,Z\rangle\langle \xi_a,Y\rangle - \langle \theta_a A\xi,Y\rangle\langle \xi_a,Z\rangle\} = 0. \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

(6) $-$ 2 $\times$ (8):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{3\langle A\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a,Y\rangle - 3\langle A\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a,Z\rangle + 2\langle \phi_a Y,Z\rangle\langle A\xi,\phi\xi_a\rangle \\
&+\langle \phi_a A\xi,Z\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a,Y\rangle - \langle \phi_a A\xi,Y\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a,Z\rangle - \langle A\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle \xi_a,Y\rangle + \langle A\xi_a,Y\rangle\langle \xi_a,Z\rangle \\
&-\langle \theta_a A\xi,Z\rangle\langle \xi_a,Y\rangle + \langle \theta_a A\xi,Y\rangle\langle \xi_a,Z\rangle - u_a\langle A\theta_a Y - \theta_a AY,Z\rangle\} = 0. \qquad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

(6) + (7) $-$ (8):

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\langle A^2\xi,Z\rangle\langle A\xi,Y\rangle + \langle A^2\xi,Y\rangle\langle A\xi,Z\rangle - 4\langle A\xi,Z\rangle\langle \xi,Y\rangle + 4\langle A\xi,Y\rangle\langle \xi,Z\rangle \\
&+\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{4\langle A\phi\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a,Y\rangle - 4\langle A\phi\xi_a,Y\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a,Z\rangle \\
&-4\langle A\xi_a,Z\rangle\langle \xi_a,Y\rangle + 4\langle A\xi_a,Y\rangle\langle \xi_a,Z\rangle\} = 0. \qquad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

Consider two orthonormal principal vectors Y_j and Y_k, corresponding to principal curvatures λ_j and λ_k respectively. Then from $\langle (R(Y_k,Y_j)A)Y_j,Y_k\rangle = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)\{\lambda_j\lambda_k + 1 + 3\langle Y_k,\phi Y_j\rangle^2\} \\
&+(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{3\langle Y_k,\phi_a Y_j\rangle^2 + \langle \theta_a Y_j,Y_j\rangle\langle \theta_a Y_k,Y_k\rangle - \langle \theta_a Y_k,Y_j\rangle^2\} = 0. \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from $\langle (R(Z,Y)A)\xi_b,\xi_b\rangle = 0$, for $b \in \{1,2,3\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\langle A^2\xi_b,Z\rangle\langle A\xi_b,Y\rangle + \langle A^2\xi_b,Y\rangle\langle A\xi_b,Z\rangle - \langle A\xi_b,Z\rangle\langle \xi_b,Y\rangle + \langle A\xi_b,Y\rangle\langle \xi_b,Z\rangle \\
&+\langle \phi A\xi_b,Y\rangle\langle \phi\xi_b,Z\rangle - \langle \phi A\xi_b,Z\rangle\langle \phi\xi_b,Y\rangle + 2\langle \phi Z,Y\rangle\langle A\xi_b,\phi\xi_b\rangle \\
&+\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{\langle \phi_a A\xi_b,Y\rangle\langle \phi_a\xi_b,Z\rangle - \langle \phi_a A\xi_b,Z\rangle\langle \phi_a\xi_b,Y\rangle + 2\langle \phi_a Z,Y\rangle\langle A\xi_b,\phi_a\xi_b\rangle \\
&+\langle \theta_a A\xi_b,Y\rangle\langle \theta_a\xi_b,Z\rangle - \langle \theta_a A\xi_b,Z\rangle\langle \theta_a\xi_b,Y\rangle\} = 0. \qquad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 3 is broken into three steps. We shall show that these following three cases cannot occur.

$$\xi \notin \mathfrak{D} \text{ and } \xi \notin \mathfrak{D}; \quad \xi \in \mathfrak{D}; \quad \xi \in \mathfrak{D}^{\perp}.$$

4.1 The case: $\xi \notin \mathfrak{D}$ and $\xi \notin \mathfrak{D}^{\perp}$

Suppose $\xi \notin \mathfrak{D}$ and $\xi \notin \mathfrak{D}^{\perp}$ at a point $x \in M$. Without loss of generality, we assume $0 < u_1 < 1$, $u_2 = u_3 = 0$.

Lemma 12. *$A\xi$, $A\xi_1 \in \mathrm{Span}\{\xi, \xi_1\}$.*

Proof. We shall first prove that $A\xi$, $A\xi_1 \in \mathcal{H}^{\perp}$. By first putting $Z = \xi$, and next ξ_1 in (7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &-3\alpha\langle \xi, Y\rangle + 3\langle A\xi, Y\rangle + u_1\langle A\xi, \theta_1 Y\rangle + 4u_1\langle A\xi_1, Y\rangle \\ &+\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{-3\langle A\xi, \xi_a\rangle\langle \xi_a, Y\rangle + \langle A\xi, \phi\xi_a\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a, Y\rangle\} = 0; \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-3\langle A\xi, \xi_1\rangle\langle \xi, Y\rangle + 4u_1\langle A\xi, Y\rangle + 3\langle A\xi_1, Y\rangle + u_1\langle A\xi_1, \theta_1 Y\rangle \\ &+\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{-3\langle A\xi_1, \xi_a\rangle\langle \xi_a, Y\rangle + \langle A\xi_1, \phi\xi_a\rangle\langle \phi\xi_a, Y\rangle\} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

By choosing $Y \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$ in the above two equations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3+u_1)\langle A\xi, Y\rangle + 4u_1\langle A\xi_1, Y\rangle = 0 \\ 4u_1\langle A\xi, Y\rangle + (3+u_1)\langle A\xi_1, Y\rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from these equations that $A\xi$, $A\xi_1 \perp \mathcal{H}_1(1)$.

Next, if we first put $Y \in \mathcal{H}_1(-1)$ in (13), followed by $Y \in \mathcal{H}_1(-1)$ and $Z = \xi_1$ in (9), then

$$\begin{aligned} (3-u_1)\langle A\xi, Y\rangle + 4u_1\langle A\xi_1, Y\rangle = 0 \\ (1+u_1)\{-\langle A\xi, Y\rangle + \langle A\xi_1, Y\rangle\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Solving these equations, gives $A\xi$, $A\xi_1 \perp \mathcal{H}_1(-1)$ and we conclude that

$$A\xi, A\xi_1 \perp \mathcal{H}. \tag{15}$$

Secondly, we shall show that $A\xi, A\xi_1 \perp \phi\xi_b$, ξ_c, for $b \in \{1,2,3\}$, $c \in \{2,3\}$. Let $Z \in \mathcal{H}$ and $Y = \phi Z$ in (8). Then $\sum_{a=1}^{3}\langle \theta_a Z, Z\rangle\langle A\xi, \phi\xi_a\rangle = 0$. In particular, if we choose a unit vector $Z \in \mathcal{H}_b(1)$ then by Lemma 10(c), $\theta_a Z \in \mathcal{H}_b(-1)$, which implies that $\langle \theta_a Z, Z\rangle = 0$, for $a \neq b$ and so

$$\langle A\xi, \phi\xi_b\rangle = 0, \quad b \in \{1,2,3\}. \tag{16}$$

By putting $Y = \xi_c$ in (13), with the help of (16), we have $4u_1\langle A\xi_1, \xi_c\rangle = 0$ and so

$$\langle A\xi_1, \xi_c\rangle = 0, \quad c \in \{2,3\}. \tag{17}$$

Next, by using the above two results, after putting $Y = \phi\xi_b$ in (14), we get

$$(u_1^2+4)\langle A\xi_1, \phi\xi_1\rangle = 4\langle A\xi_1, \phi\xi_2\rangle = 4\langle A\xi_1, \phi\xi_3\rangle = 0$$

these mean that

$$\langle A\xi_1, \phi\xi_b\rangle = 0, \quad b \in \{1, 2, 3\}. \tag{18}$$

Similarly, with the helps of (16)–(18), it follows from (14) that $\langle A\xi, \xi_2\rangle = \langle A\xi, \xi_3\rangle = 0$. From this result, together with (15)–(18), gives the lemma. □

We define a unit vector $U := (\xi_1 - u_1\xi)/\sqrt{1-u_1^2}$. Note that $\{\xi, U\}$ is an orthonormal basis for Span$\{\xi, \xi_1\}$. From Lemma 12, and (13), we have

$$A\xi = \alpha\xi + \rho U; \quad AU = \rho\xi + \sigma U, \tag{19}$$

$$A\xi_1 = \alpha\xi_1 + \rho\left\{\sqrt{1-u_1^2}\xi - u_1 U\right\}. \tag{20}$$

Further, by putting $Z = \xi$ and $Y = U$ in (8), we obtain

$$\rho(\alpha\sigma - \rho^2) = 0. \tag{21}$$

By virtue of (19), if we choose $Z \in \mathcal{H}$, then (10) gives

$$\sum_{a=1}^{3}\{\langle A\phi\xi_a, Z\rangle\phi\xi_a - \langle A\xi_a, Z\rangle\xi_a\} = 0.$$

Since $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \phi\xi_1, \phi\xi_2, \phi\xi_3\}$ is linearly independent, $\langle A\phi\xi_a, Z\rangle = \langle A\xi_a, Z\rangle = 0$ and so $A\xi_a$, $A\phi\xi_a \perp \mathcal{H}$. Hence we obtain

$$A\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}. \tag{22}$$

By making use of (9), (19) and (22), we obtain

$$A\theta_1 Y = \theta_1 AY, \quad Y \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{23}$$

Lemma 13. *Either all principal curvatures vanish or none of them is zero.*

Proof. We first show that $\phi\xi_1$ (and so is ϕU) is principal. By putting $Y = \phi\xi_1$ in (10), with the help of (19)–(21), we obtain

$$(1-u_1^2)\langle A\phi\xi_1, Z\rangle + \sum_{a=1}^{3}\{-\langle A\phi\xi_1, \phi\xi_a\rangle\langle\phi\xi_a, Z\rangle + \langle A\phi\xi_1, \xi_a\rangle\langle\xi_a, Z\rangle\} = 0.$$

This equation implies that $A\phi\xi_1$ is perpendicular to the vectors

$$\xi_2 - u_1\phi\xi_3,\ (2-u_1^2)\xi_2 - u_1\phi\xi_3;\ \xi_3 + u_1\phi\xi_2,\ (2-u_1^2)\xi_3 + u_1\phi\xi_2$$

which deduces that $A\phi\xi_1 \perp \xi_2, \xi_3, \phi\xi_2, \phi\xi_3$. This fact, together with Lemma 12 and (22), gives $A\phi\xi_1 = \delta_0\phi\xi_1$.

Since $\mathcal{H}$ is invariant under A and θ_1; and by (23), we can construct orthonormal bases $\{X_1, \cdots, X_{4m-8}\}$ for $\mathcal{H}$ and $\{E_0 = \phi U, E_1, \cdots, E_6\}$ for $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} AX_r =& \lambda_r X_r, \quad r \in \{1, \cdots, 4m-8\} \\ \theta_1 X_r =& \begin{cases} X_r, & r \in \{1, \cdots, 2m-4\}; \\ -X_r, & r \in \{2m-3, \cdots, 4m-8\}. \end{cases} \\ AE_i =& \delta_i E_i, \quad i \in \{0, \cdots, 6\}. \end{aligned}$$

By putting $Y_j = E_i$ and $Y_k = X_r$ in (11), since $\langle \theta_b X_r, X_r \rangle = 0$, for $b \in \{2, 3\}$, we obtain

$$(\delta_i - \lambda_r)\{\delta_i \lambda_r + 1 + \langle \theta_1 X_r, X_r \rangle \langle \theta_1 E_i, E_i \rangle\} = 0. \tag{24}$$

We consider two cases: $\delta_0 = 0$; and $\delta_0 \neq 0$.

Case 1. $\delta_0 = 0$.

We set $i = 0$ in (24) to get $0 = \lambda_r(1 \pm \langle \theta_1 \phi U, \phi U \rangle) = \lambda_r(1 \pm u_1)$. Hence $\lambda_r = 0$, for $r = \{1, \cdots, 4m-8\}$ and (24) reduces to

$$\delta_i(1 + \langle \theta_1 X_r, X_r \rangle \langle \theta_1 E_i, E_i \rangle) = 0.$$

Since $\langle \theta_1 X_1, X_1 \rangle = 1$ and $\langle \theta_1 X_{4m-8}, X_{4m-8} \rangle = -1$, all $\delta_i = 0$ and so all principal curvatures are zero.

Case 2. $\delta_0 \neq 0$.

We first claim that all $\lambda_r \neq 0$. Suppose to the contrary that $\lambda_s = 0$, for some $s \in \{1, \cdots, 4m-8\}$. We set $i = 0$ and $r = s$ in (24) to get $0 = 1 \pm \langle \theta_1 \phi U, \phi U \rangle = 1 \pm u_1$. This is a contradiction. We conclude that $\lambda_r \neq 0$, for $r \in \{1, \cdots, 4m-8\}$.

Next, we claim that all $\delta_i \neq 0$. For otherwise, we can set $r = 1$ and $r = 4m-8$ respectively in (24) to obtain a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 14. *$A\xi = \alpha\xi$ and $A\xi_a = \alpha_a \xi_a$, for $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Suppose ξ is not principal or $\rho \neq 0$. In view of (21), $\alpha\sigma = \rho^2$ and so $\alpha + \sigma \neq 0$. Further, we can verify that $A(\rho\xi - \alpha U) = 0$ and $A(\alpha\xi + \rho U) = (\alpha + \sigma)(\alpha\xi + \rho U)$. But this contradicts Lemma 13, hence we conclude that $A\xi = \alpha\xi$ and $\rho = 0$. From (20), we can see that ξ_1 is also a principal vector.

Next, fixed $b \in \{2, 3\}$. Let Y be a unit vector in $\mathcal{H}$ and $Z = \phi Y$ in (12). Then

$$-\langle A\xi_b, \phi\xi_b \rangle + \langle \theta_1 Y, Y \rangle \langle A\xi_b, \phi_1 \xi_b \rangle = 0.$$

By first putting $Y \in \mathcal{H}_1(-1)$, followed by $Y \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$, we obtain $\langle A\xi_b, \phi\xi_b \rangle = \langle A\xi_b, \phi_1\xi_b \rangle = 0$, more precisely $\langle A\xi_2, \phi\xi_2 \rangle = \langle A\xi_3, \phi\xi_3 \rangle = \langle A\xi_2, \xi_3 \rangle = 0$. It follows that we may write

$$A\xi_b = \alpha_b \xi_b + \rho_b U_b, \quad U_2 := \frac{\phi\xi_3 - u_1\xi_2}{\sqrt{1 - u_1^2}}, \quad U_3 := \frac{\phi\xi_2 + u_1\xi_3}{\sqrt{1 - u_1^2}}. \tag{25}$$

In view of the above equation, after putting $Z = U_b$ in (12), we have

$$\rho_b\{\rho_b A U_b - \sigma_b A\xi_b\} = 0, \quad (\sigma_b := \langle AU_b, U_b \rangle).$$

From this equation, we can see that ξ_b is principal, for $b \in \{2,3\}$. Indeed, if ξ_b is not principal or equivalently $\rho_b \neq 0$ then the above equation implies that

$$AU_b = \rho_b \xi_b + \sigma_b U_b; \quad \alpha_b \sigma_b = \rho_b^2. \tag{26}$$

It follows from (25) and (26) that $\rho_b \xi_b - \alpha_b U_b$ and $\alpha_b \xi_b + \rho_b U_b$ are principal vectors correspond to the principal curvatures 0 and $\alpha_b + \sigma_b \neq 0$ respectively. This contradicts Lemma 13, hence ξ_b is principal, for $b \in \{2,3\}$. □

Lemma 15. *Let M be a semi-parallel real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$. Then either $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}$ or $\xi \in \mathcal{D}^\perp$ at each point $x \in M$.*

Proof. Consider the open subset

$$M_0 := \{x \in M : \ g(x) := u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2 \notin \{0,1\}\}.$$

Then by Lemma 14, we have $A\xi = \alpha\xi$ and $A\mathfrak{D}^\perp \subset \mathfrak{D}^\perp$ on M_0. In view of Theorem 5–7, M_0 is an open part of a real hypersurface of type A or B and either $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}$ or $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}^\perp$ at each point in M_0. Hence M_0 is empty and this completes the proof. □

4.2 The case: $\xi \in \mathcal{D}$

Suppose $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}$ at each point $x \in M$. Then the vectors $\xi, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \phi\xi_1, \phi\xi_2, \phi\xi_3$ are orthonormal and each $u_a = 0$. By using Lemma 4, we have

$$0 = \langle (R(\phi\xi_1, \xi)A)Z, \phi\xi_1 \rangle = \langle A\xi, Z \rangle + 3\sum_{a=1}^{3} \langle A\phi_a\phi\xi_1, Z \rangle \langle \phi_a\phi\xi_1, \xi \rangle = 4\langle A\xi, Z \rangle.$$

Hence $A\xi = 0$. By Theorem 8, M is an open part of a real hypersurface of type B. This is a contradiction as $\alpha \neq 0$ according to Theorem 7. Hence we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 16. *Let M be a semi-parallel real hypersurface in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$. Then $\xi \in \mathcal{D}^\perp$ at each point $x \in M$.*

4.3 The case: $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}^\perp$

We suppose that $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}^\perp$ at each $x \in M$. Let $J_1 \in \mathfrak{J}_x$ such that $J_1 N = JN$. Then we have

$$\xi_1 = \xi = -\theta_1\xi_1, \ \xi_2 = \theta_1\xi_2 = \phi\xi_3, \ \xi_3 = \theta_1\xi_3 = -\phi\xi_2, \ u_1 = 1, \ u_2 = u_3 = 0$$

Lemma 17. $A\xi = \alpha\xi$.

Proof. Fixed $b \in \{2,3\}$. By putting $Y = \xi_b$ and $Z = \xi$ in (7), we have $\langle A\xi, \xi_b \rangle = 0$. Using this fact, after putting $Y \in \mathcal{H}$ and $Z = \xi$ in (7), we obtain $\langle A\xi, 7Y + \theta_1 Y \rangle = 0$. By using Lemma 10(a), we have $A\xi \perp \mathcal{H}$. Hence we conclude that $A\xi = \alpha\xi$. □

Fixed $b \in \{2,3\}$. By putting $Y \in \mathcal{H}$ and $Z = \xi_b$ in (7), we obtain $\langle A\xi_b, Y+\theta_1 Y\rangle = 0$, which implies that $A\xi_b \perp \mathcal{H}_1(1)$. Next, by putting $Y \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$ and $Z \in \mathcal{H}_1(-1)$ in (7), we have $2\langle AY, Z\rangle = 0$. This implies that

$$A\mathcal{H}_1(1) \subset \mathcal{H}_1(1). \tag{27}$$

Let $Y \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$ be a unit vector and $Z = \phi Y$ in (12). Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& -\langle A\xi_b, \phi\xi_b\rangle + \sum_{a=1}^{3}\langle \phi_a\phi Y, Y\rangle\langle A\xi_b, \phi_a\xi_b\rangle \\ =& -\langle A\xi_b, \phi\xi_b\rangle + \sum_{a=1}^{3}\langle \theta_a Y, Y\rangle\langle A\xi_b, \phi_a\xi_b\rangle \\ =& -\langle A\xi_b, \phi\xi_b\rangle + \langle A\xi_b, \phi_1\xi_b\rangle = -2\langle A\xi_b, \phi\xi_b\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\langle A\xi_3, \xi_2\rangle = 0$ and so we obtain

$$A\xi_b - \alpha_b\xi_b \in \mathcal{H}_1(-1), \quad b \in \{2,3\}. \tag{28}$$

By substituting $Z = \xi_b$ in (12), we obtain

$$0 = -||A\xi_b||^2 A\xi_b + \alpha_b A^2\xi_b - \alpha_b\xi_b + A\xi_b + \theta_1 A\xi_b - \alpha_b\theta_1\xi_b.$$

By (28), we have $\theta_1(A\xi_b - \alpha_b\xi_b) = -(A\xi_b - \alpha_b\xi_b)$. Hence we obtain

$$\alpha_b A^2\xi_b - ||A\xi_b||^2 A\xi_b = 0, \quad b \in \{2,3\}. \tag{29}$$

Lemma 18. *Suppose ξ_b is not principal, for some $b \in \{2,3\}$. Let $\rho_b = ||\phi_b A\xi_b||$ and $U_b = -\rho_b^{-1}\phi_b^2 A\xi_b$. Then*

$$AU_b = \rho_b\xi_b + \sigma_b U_b, \quad \alpha_b\sigma_b = \rho_b^2. \tag{30}$$

If $X \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$ is a unit vector with $AX = \lambda X$ then either $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = \alpha$ $(\neq 0)$. Further we have

(a) if $\lambda = \alpha$ then $0 \geq 2\rho_b^2 - \alpha_b^2\sum_{a=2}^{3}\langle\theta_a U_b, X\rangle^2$; and

(b) if $\lambda = 0$ then $0 \geq 2\alpha_b^2 - \rho_b^2\sum_{a=2}^{3}\langle\theta_a U_b, X\rangle^2$.

Proof. The equation (30) is an immediate consequence of (29). If $\alpha = 0$ then we set $Y \in \mathcal{H}_1(-1)$ in (5) to get $AY = 0$ and so $A\mathcal{H}_1(-1) \subset \mathcal{H}_1(-1)$. But this contradicts our assumption and (28). Hence, we have $\alpha \neq 0$.

Let $X \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$ be a unit vector with $AX = \lambda X$, the existence of such X is ensured by (27). By putting $Y = Z = X$ in (5), we have $\lambda(\lambda - \alpha) = 0$. On the other hand, we can verify that $AE_1 = 0$ and $AE_2 = (\alpha_b + \sigma_b)E_2$, where

$$E_1 := \frac{\rho_b\xi_b - \alpha_b U_b}{\sqrt{\rho_b^2 + \alpha_b^2}}; \quad E_2 := \frac{\alpha_b\xi + \rho_b U_b}{\sqrt{\rho_b^2 + \alpha_b^2}}.$$

Suppose $\lambda = \alpha$. By setting $Y_k = E_1$ and $Y_j = X$ in (11), we obtain

$$0 = 1 + \langle \theta_1 E_1, E_1 \rangle + \sum_{a=1}^{3} \{3\langle \phi_a X, E_1 \rangle^2 - \langle \theta_a E_1, X \rangle^2\}$$

$$0 \geq 1 + \langle \theta_1 E_1, E_1 \rangle - \sum_{a=2}^{3} \langle \theta_a E_1, X \rangle^2 = 1 + \frac{\rho_b^2 - \alpha_b^2}{\rho_b^2 + \alpha_b^2} - \sum_{a=2}^{3} \frac{\alpha_b^2 \langle \theta_a U_b, X \rangle^2}{\rho_b^2 + \alpha_b^2}$$

$$\geq 2\rho_b^2 - \alpha_b^2 \sum_{a=2}^{3} \langle \theta_a U_b, X \rangle^2.$$

Similarly, when $\lambda = 0$, we set $Y_k = E_2$ and $Y_j = X$ in (11) to get

$$0 \geq 1 + \langle \theta_1 E_2, E_2 \rangle - \sum_{a=2}^{3} \langle \theta_a E_2, X \rangle^2 = 1 + \frac{\alpha_b^2 - \rho_b^2}{\rho_b^2 + \alpha_b^2} - \sum_{a=2}^{3} \frac{\rho_b^2 \langle \theta_a U_b, X \rangle^2}{\rho_b^2 + \alpha_b^2}$$

$$\geq 2\alpha_b^2 - \rho_b^2 \sum_{a=2}^{3} \langle \theta_a U_b, X \rangle^2.$$

□

Lemma 19. *$A\xi_b = \alpha_b \xi_b$, for $b \in \{2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that ξ_b is not principal. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. $AX = \alpha X$ or $AX = 0$, for all $X \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$.

Since $\dim \mathcal{H}_1(1) = 2m - 2 \geq 4$, there is a unit vector $X \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$, which is perpendicular to $\theta_2 U_b$ and $\theta_3 U_b$. Then Lemma 18(a)–(b) imply that either $0 \geq 2\rho_b^2$ or $0 \geq 2\alpha_b^2$. However, this contradicts the fact that $\alpha_b \sigma_b = \rho_b^2 \neq 0$. Hence this case cannot occur.

Case 2. $AX_1 = \alpha X_1$ and $AX_2 = 0$, for some unit vectors X_1, $X_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)$.

The two inequalities in Lemma 18 imply that

$$0 \geq \alpha_b^2 \sum_{a=2}^{3} \{1 - \langle \theta_a U_b, X_1 \rangle^2\} + \rho_b^2 \sum_{a=2}^{3} \{1 - \langle \theta_a U_b, X_2 \rangle^2\}.$$

Since $\theta_a U_b$ and X_1 are unit vectors, by Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality, $1 - \langle \theta_a U_b, X_1 \rangle^2 \geq 0$ and equality holds if and only if $X_1 = \pm \theta_a U_b$. Further, since $\theta_2 \theta_3 U_b = -\theta_3 \theta_2 U_b$, we have $\theta_2 U_b$ and $\theta_3 U_b$ are orthonormal. Hence $1 - \langle \theta_2 U_b, X_1 \rangle^2$ and $1 - \langle \theta_3 U_b, X_1 \rangle^2$ cannot be both zero. Hence we conclude that $\sum_{a=2}^{3} \{1 - \langle \theta_a U_b, X_1 \rangle^2\} > 0$. Similarly, we have $\sum_{a=2}^{3} \{1 - \langle \theta_a U_b, X_2 \rangle^2\} > 0$. It follows that $\alpha_b = \rho_b = 0$. This is a contradiction.

In view of these cases, we conclude that ξ_b is principal for $b \in \{2, 3\}$. □

4.4 Proof of Theorem 3

We are in a position to prove Theorem 3. We have showed that if a real hypersurface M in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$ is semi-parallel then $A\xi = \alpha\xi$ and $A\mathfrak{D}^\perp \subset \mathfrak{D}^\perp$; and $\xi \in \mathfrak{D}^\perp$ at each point in M. According to Theorem 5, M is an open part of a real hypersurface of type A. Now we follow the notations in Theorem 6. If we put $Y_k = \xi_2$ and $Y_j \in T_\mu = \mathcal{H}_1(1)$ in (11), then

$$0 = 1 + \sum_{a=1}^{3} \langle \theta_a Y_j, Y_j \rangle \langle \theta_a \xi_2, \xi_2 \rangle = 2$$

which is impossible. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

5 Recurrent real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$

In this section, we shall show that there are no recurrent real hypersurfaces in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$. We begin with the following result.

Theorem 20. *Let M be a connected Riemannian manifold and let F be a symmetric endomorphism on TM. If F is recurrent then F is semi-parallel.*

Proof. Suppose F is recurrent, that is $(\nabla_X F)Y = \omega(X)FY$, for all $X, Y \in TM$, where ω is a 1-form on M and ∇ is the levi-Civita connection on M. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the maximal open dense subset of M such that the multiplicities of the eigenvalue functions of F are constant in each component of $\mathcal{U}$. It is trivial if $F = 0$ on $\mathcal{U}$. Consider a point $x \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $F \neq 0$. Then there is an eigenvalue λ of F, which is nowhere zero in a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{U}$ of x. Let Y be a unit eigenvector field of F on $\mathcal{U}_1$ corresponding to λ. Then

$$X\lambda = \langle (\nabla_X F)Y, Y \rangle = \lambda\omega(X)$$

for all vector field X on $\mathcal{U}_1$, or equivalently $d\lambda = \lambda\omega$. Hence

$$0 = d^2\lambda = d\lambda \wedge \omega + \lambda d\omega = \lambda d\omega.$$

This means that $d\omega = 0$ at x and so $(\nabla_X \omega)Y = (\nabla_Y \omega)X$, for all $X, Y \in T_xM$.

Denote by $\nabla_{X,Y}F$ the second order covariant derivative of F, that is,

$$(\nabla_{X,Y}F)Z = \nabla_X\{(\nabla_Y F)Z\} - (\nabla_Y F)\nabla_X Z - (\nabla_{\nabla_X Y}F)Z$$

for all vector fields X, Y, Z tangent to M. It follows that

$$(\nabla_{X,Y}F)Z = \{(\nabla_X\omega)Y\}FZ + \omega(Y)(\nabla_X F)Z = \{(\nabla_X\omega)Y\}FZ + \omega(Y)\omega(X)FZ$$

for all $X, Y, Z \in T_xM$. It follows that

$$(R(X,Y)F)Z = (\nabla_{X,Y}F)Z - (\nabla_{Y,X}F)Z = 0$$

and so $R \cdot F = 0$ at all such $x \in \mathcal{U}_1$. By a standard topological argument, we conclude that $R \cdot F = 0$ on M. □

The following result can be obtained immediately from Theorem 3 and Theorem 20.

Corollary 21. *There does not exist any recurrent real hypersurface M in $G_2(\mathbb{C}_{m+2})$, $m \geq 3$.*

References

[1] J. Berndt, Riemannian geometry of complex two-plane Grassmannian, *Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino* 55(1997), 19–83.

[2] J. Berndt, Y.J. Suh, Real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians, *Monatsh. Math.* 127(1999) 1–14.

[3] J. Berndt, Y.J. Suh, Real hypersurfaces with isometric Reeb flows on real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians, *Monatsh. Math.* 137(2002) 87–98.

[4] P.M. Chacón, G.A. Lobos, Pseudo-parallel Lagrangian submanifolds in complex space forms, *Differ. Geom. Appl.* 27(2009), 137–145.

[5] J. Deprez, Semi-parallel hypersurfaces, *Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino*, 44(1986), 303-316.

[6] J. Deprez, Semi-parallel surfaces in euclidean space, *J. Geom.* 25(1985), 192–200.

[7] F. Dillen, Semi-parallel hypersurfaces of a real space form, *Isr. J. Math.* 75(1991), 193–202.

[8] S. Kim, H. Lee, H.Y. Yang, Real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians with recurrent shape operator, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.* 34(2011), 295–305.

[9] S. Kobayashi, K. Nomizu, *Foundations of differential geometry, Vol 1*, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1963.

[10] M. Kon, Semi-parallel CR submanifolds in a complex space form, *Colloq. Math.* 124(2011), 237–246.

[11] H. Lee, Y.J. Suh, Real hypersurfaces of tyep B in complex two-plane Grassmannians related to the Reeb vector, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* 47(2010), 445–561.

[12] Ü. Lumiste, *Semiparallel submanifolds in space forms*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2009.

[13] C. Machado, J.D. Pérez, Y.J. Suh, Real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians some of whose Jacobi operators are ξ invariant, *Int. J. Math.* 23(2012), 1250002 (12 pages), DOI: 10.1142/S0129167X1100746X.

[14] C. Machado, J.D. Pérez, Y.J. Suh, Real hypersurfaces of Codazzi type in complex two-plane Grassmannians, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.* (in press).

[15] S. Maeda, Real hypersurfaces of complex projective spaces, *Math. Ann.* 263(1983), 473–478.

[16] H. Naitoh, Parallel submanifolds of complex space forms, I, II, *Nagoya Math. J.* 90(1983), 85–117; 91(1983), 119–149.

[17] R. Niebergall, P.J. Ryan, Semi-parallel and semi-symmetric real hypersurfaces in complex space forms, *Kyungpook Math. J.* 38(1998), 227–234.

[18] M. Ortega, Classifications of real hypersurfaces in complex space forms by means of curvature conditions, *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin* 9(2002), 351–360.

[19] Y.J. Suh, Real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians with parallel shape operator, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* 67(2003), 493–502.

[20] Y.J. Suh, Real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians with Reeb parallel Ricci tensor, *J. Geom. Phys.* 64(2013), 1–11.

[21] Y.J. Suh, Real hypersurfaces of type B in complex two-plane Grassmannians, *Monatsh. Math.* 147(2006) 337–355.

[22] Y.J. Suh, Recurrent real hypersurfaces in complex two-plane Grassmannians, *Acta Math. Hungar.* 112(2006), 89–102.

[23] Y. Wong, Recurrent tensors on a linearly connected differential manifold, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 99(1961), 325–341.